

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION N
10/647,469	08/26/2003	Steven T. Fink	240139US6YA	2304
22850	7590 06/04/2004		EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			PASCHALL, MARK H	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		3742	,

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	T & 50 '75 & 51'	44.	·		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	\sim		
Office Action Summan	10/647,469	FINK, STEVEN T.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Mark H Paschall	3742			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addre	ess		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was preply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this comn D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.		
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) is/are pending in the applicatio	n.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6) Claim(s) <u>1-4,6,8,9,11-14,21,22 and 1617</u> is/are	-				
7) Claim(s) <u>5,7,10,15 and 18-20</u> is/are objected to					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>26 August 2003</u> is/are:	, , , , , ,	-			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	= : :				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	amilier. Note the attached Office	Action of form PTO	-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents)-(d) or (f).			
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	• •		age		
application from the International Bureau					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.			
A44b4/-1					
Attachment(s) 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-1	52)		
	-,				

Art Unit: 3742

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 5,6,13,14 are objected to because of the following informalities: claim 6 defines that the focus ring "comprises a plurality of holes". Claim 6 should be redefined to specify, "further comprising a plurality of holes in the focus ring", or similar language. Appropriate correction is required. The same changes should be made to claims 7,13,14 since these claims contain similar language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 21 sets forth that the holes in the focus ring are larger than the holes in the ring closer to the second side. It is not clear if the holes have a varying diameter or the holes have a constant diameter since the orientation of the first and second sides has not been defined. For instance, if the first and second sides were the top and bottom of the ring (lying in planes parallel to the radius of the ring) then the holes would have to be of varying diameter. Applicant should define the first and second sides relative to the ring orientation, to make clear the position of the holes.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1,2,11,12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Ishii . Note focus ring 6 in Ishii in figure 1 , where the top surface of the ring 9first or major side) has a width smaller than the bottom surface (second or minor side). As per claim 2 Ishii teaches a quartz material for the ring.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3,4,13,14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishii. These claims call for the ring to be comprised of dielectric or partially metal surface. Since Ishii teaches use of other non-conductors it is considered a matter of choice for the artisan to choose the claimed materials since the choice of material depends on the end use of the reactor and the gases and materials to be used.

Claims 8,9,16,17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishii in view of Park et al. Ishii teaches the claimed subject matter except for showing use of mounting points to connect the ring to the chuck. Park et al in figure 10 clearly show use of mounting points 330 which are used to connect the chuck to the ring. Choice of such mounting points is obvious in view of Park et al since Park et al evidence that it is routine and obvious to use these points, as one of many schemes available that would correctly fasten the chuck to the ring. In view of this teaching it would have been obvious to modify Ishii to use connecting points such as holes, to connect the chuck to the ring.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5,7,10,15,18,19,20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 5 contains ring specifications not taught in the prior art of record, Likewise claim 7 asets forth varying size holes and claim 16 defines holes in the focus ring, features not set forth in the prior art of record.

Claims 21 and 22 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Shim, Johnson and Nezu are cited for disclosing plasma systems having focus rings.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark H Paschall whose telephone number is 703 308-1642. The examiner can normally be reached on 7am - 3pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ehud Gartenberg can be reached on 703 308-2634. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mark H Paschall

Primary Examiner Art Unit 3742

mp

MorPan